arXiv:1607.02418v2 [math.AP] 10 Feb 2017

HOMOGENIZATION OF A FULLY COUPLED THERMOELASTICITY PROBLEM FOR A HIGHLY HETEROGENEOUS MEDIUM WITH *A PRIORI* KNOWN PHASE TRANSFORMATIONS

Michael Eden

Center for Industrial Mathematics, FB 3
University of Bremen, Germany
Bibliotheksstr. 1, 28359, Bremen

Adrian Muntean

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Karlstad, Sweden
Universitetsgatan 2, 651 88 Karlstad

Abstract. We investigate a linear, fully coupled thermoelasticity problem for a highly heterogeneous, two-phase medium. The medium in question consists of a connected matrix with disconnected, initially periodically distributed inclusions separated by a sharp interface undergoing an *a priori* known interface movement due to phase transformations. After transforming the moving geometry to an ε-periodic, fixed reference domain, we establish the well-posedness of the model and derive a number of ε-independent *a priori* estimates. Via a two-scale convergence argument, we then show that the ε-dependent solutions converge to solutions of a corresponding upscaled model with distributed time-dependent microstructures.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider a heterogeneous medium where the two building components are different solid phases of the same material (like *austenite* and *bainite* phases in steel, e.g.) separated by a sharp interface. One phase is assumed to be a connected matrix in which finely interwoven, periodically distributed inclusion of the second phase (which is therefore disconnected) are embedded. We refer to these phases as microstructures.

Our interest is the case where phase transformations are possible, e.g., one phase might grow at the expanse of the other phase, thereby leading to an interface movement and, as a consequence, time dependent domains that are not necessarily periodic anymore. However, we assume to have *a priori* knowledge of the phase transformation, i.e., the movement of the interface is prescribed. For a rather general modeling of phase transformations (including a possible mathematical treatment), we refer the reader to [42], and for the metallurgical perspective on phase transformation in steel (especially, w.r.t the bainite transformation), we refer to [18, 31, 38]. Looking at such a highly-heterogeneous medium, we study the coupling between

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35B27; Secondary: 74F05, 74Q15.

Key words and phrases. Homogenization, two-phase thermoelasticity, two-scale convergence, time-dependent domains, distributed microstructures.

the mechanics of the material and the thermal conduction effect (*thermomechanics*) under the influence of the phase transformation. In particular, we explore the interplay between *surface stresses* and *latent heat*, see for instance [22] for related thermoelasticity scenarios. In this work, we assume the quasi-static assumption to hold; that is the mechanical processes are reversible. Furthermore, the constitutive laws are taken to be linear. Our main contribution here is the treatment of the mechanical dissipation and of *a priori* prescribed phase transformations in the thermoelasticity setting.

It is worth noting that the homogenization of different thermoelasticity problems has already been addressed in the literature. In one of the earlier works, [19], a one-phase linear thermoelasticity problem is homogenized via a semi-group approach. In [40], a formal homogenization via asymptotic expansion for a similar model (but for a one-dimensional geometry) was conducted. A two-phase problem including transmission conditions and discontinuities at the interface has been investigated in the context of homogenization (using *periodic unfolding*) in [16]. A similar situation of a highly heterogeneous two-phase medium with *a priori* given phase transformation was considered in [14]. Here, the authors use formal asymptotic expansions to derive a homogenized model. We also want to point out the structural similarity between the thermoelasticity models and models for poroelasticity, cf. *Biot's linear poroelasticity* [6, 37]; for a reference of the derivation of the Biot model via two-scale homogenization, we refer to [27, Section 5.2]. Examples for homogenization in the context of two-phase poroelasticity, so called double poroelasticity, can be found in [2, 15]. For some homogenization results via formal asymptotics for problems where the micro-structural changes are not prescribed, we refer to [8, 21, 25].

As an alternative approach in the modeling of phase transformation, in particular in the case of phase transformation in steel, phase-field models are often considered, we refer to, e.g., [24, 28]. Some thoughts regarding possible numerical simulations of a similar one-phase problem for a highly heterogeneous media are given in [33]. In [40], a numerical framework based on homogenization (via averaging) for a thermoelasticity problem in highly heterogeneous media is developed and investigated.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce the ε-microscopic geometry and the thermoelasticity problem and, then, transform this to a fixed reference domain. The well-posedness of our microscopic model is investigated in Section 3. In addition, ε-independent estimates necessary for the homogenization process are established. Finally, in Section 4, we perform the homogenization procedure relying on the two-scale convergence technique.

2. Setting and transformation to fixed domain

We start by describing the geometrical setting of the ε-parametrized microscopic problem including the transformation characterizing the interface movement. After that, we go on with formulating the microscopic problem for a highly heterogeneous media – first for the moving interface and then for the back-transformed, fixed interface.

We note that our setting (with the transformation) is closely related to the notion of *locally periodic* domains, see [17, 41]. In addition, we also refer to [12, 26], where similar transformation settings are introduced.

Let $S = (0,T)$, $T > 0$, be a time interval. Let Ω be the interior of a union of a finite number of closed cubes Q_j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, whose vertices are in $\mathbb{Q}^3$ such that, in addition, Ω is a Lipschitz domain. In general, Ω could be much more general. By this particular choice, we avoid the inherent technical difficulties that would arise in the homogenization process due to the involvement of general geometries; we are focusing instead on the technical difficulties arising a) due to the strong coupling in the structure of the governing partial differential equations and b) due to the time-dependency of the geometry.

In addition, we denote the outer normal vector of Ω with $\nu = \nu(x)$. Let $Y = (0,1)^3$ be the open unit cell in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Take Y_A, $Y_B \subset Y$ two disjoint open sets, such that Y_A is connected, such that $\Gamma := \overline{Y_A} \cap \overline{Y_B}$ is a C^3 interface, $\Gamma = \partial Y_B$, $\overline{Y_B} \subset Y$, and $Y = Y_A \cup Y_B \cup \Gamma$, see Figure 1. With $n_0 = n_0(y)$, $y \in \Gamma$, we denote the normal vector of Γ pointing outwards of Y_B.

For $\varepsilon > 0$, we introduce the εY-periodic, initial domains Ω_A^ε and Ω_B^ε and interface Γ^ε representing the two phases and the phase boundary, respectively, via ($i \in \{A, B\}$)

$$\Omega_i^\varepsilon = \Omega \cap \left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \varepsilon(Y_i + k) \right), \qquad \Gamma^\varepsilon = \Omega \cap \left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \varepsilon(\Gamma + k) \right).$$

Here, for a set $M \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we employ the notation

$$\varepsilon(M + k) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \ : \ \frac{x}{\varepsilon} - k \in M \right\}.$$

From now on, we take $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be a sequence of monotonically decreasing positive numbers converging to zero such that Ω can be represented as the union of cubes of size ε. Note that this is possible due to the assumed structure of Ω.

Here $n_0^\varepsilon = n_0(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$, $x \in \Gamma^\varepsilon$, denotes the unit normal vector (extended by periodicity) pointing outwards Ω_B^ε into Ω_A^ε. The above construction ensures that Ω_A^ε is connected and that Ω_B^ε is disconnected. We also have that $\partial\Omega_B^\varepsilon \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$. In the different case that both Ω_A^ε and Ω_B^ε are connected, we additionally would need to rely on special uniform extension operators, see [20], in order to pass to the homogenization limit.

We assume that $s\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \overline{Y}$ is a function such that

(1) $s \in C^1(\overline{S}; C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^2_\#(Y))$,[1]
(2) $s(t,x,\cdot)_{|\overline{Y}}\colon \overline{Y} \to \overline{Y}$ is bijective for every $(t,x) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega}$,
(3) $s^{-1} \in C^1(\overline{S}; C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^2_\#(Y))$,[2]
(4) $s(0,x,y) = y$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and all $y \in \overline{Y}$,
(5) $s(t,x,y) = y$ for all $(t,x) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega}$ and all $y \in \partial Y$,
(6) there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\partial Y, \gamma) > c$ for all $\gamma \in s(t,x,\Gamma)$ and $(t,x) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega}$,
(7) $s(t,x,y) = y$ for all $(t,x) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega}$ and for all $y \in Y$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\partial Y, y) < \frac{c}{2}$,
(8) there are constants $c_s, C_s > 0$ such that

$$c_s \leq \det(\nabla s(t,x,y)) \leq C_s, \quad (t,x,y) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^3$$

[1]Here, and in the following, the # subscript denotes periodicity, i.e., for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $C^k_\#(Y) = \{f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^3) : f(x + e_i) = f(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$, e_i basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^3$.

[2]Here, $s^{-1}\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \overline{Y}$ is the unique function such that $s(t,x,s^{-1}(t,x,y)) = y$ for all $(t,x,y) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \in \overline{Y}$ extended by periodicity to all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

and set the (t,x)-parametrized sets

$$Y_A(t,x) = s(t,x,Y_A), \quad Y_B(t,x) = s(t,x,Y_B), \quad \Gamma(t,x) = s(t,x,\Gamma).$$

Here, Assumptions (1)-(3) ensure that the transformation is regular enough for our further considerations (e.g., to guarantee that the curvature of the deformed domains is well-defined). For the initial configuration, we have $Y_A = Y_A(0,x)$, $Y_B = Y_B(0,x)$, and $\Gamma = \Gamma(0,x)$ (Assumption (4)). In addition, with Assumption (6), we get a uniform (w.r.t. $(t,x) \in \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega}$) minimum distance between the interface $\Gamma(t,x)$ and the boundary of the Y-cell and, with Assumption (5) and Assumption (7), make sure that points near the boundary of the unit cell Y are not deformed. Finally, Assumption (8) is of particular importance when it comes to proving ε-independent estimates.

We introduce the operations

$$\begin{aligned} [\cdot]\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{Z}^3, \quad [x] = k \text{ such that } x - [x] \in Y, \\ \{\cdot\}\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to Y, \quad \{x\} = x - [x] \end{aligned}$$

and define the ε-dependent function[3]

$$s^\varepsilon\colon \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad s^\varepsilon(t,x) := \varepsilon\left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right] + \varepsilon s\left(t, \varepsilon\left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right], \left\{\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right\}\right).$$

This function is well-defined as $\left\{\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right\} \in Y$ and $\varepsilon\left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right] \in \overline{\Omega}$. Since $s(t,x,y) = y$ for all $(t,x) \in \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega}$ and for all $y \in Y$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\partial Y, y) > \frac{c}{2}$, we see that

$$s^\varepsilon \in C^1(\overline{S}; C^2(\overline{\Omega})).$$

For $i \in \{A,B\}$ and $t \in \overline{S}$, we set the time dependent sets $\Omega_i^\varepsilon(t)$ and $\Gamma^\varepsilon(t)$ and the corresponding non-cylindrical space-time domains Q_i^ε and space-time phase boundary Σ^ε via

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_i^\varepsilon(t) = s^\varepsilon(t,\Omega_i^\varepsilon), \qquad Q_i^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{t\in S}\left(\{t\}\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon(t)\right), \\ \Gamma^\varepsilon(t) = s^\varepsilon(t,\Gamma^\varepsilon), \qquad \Sigma^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{t\in S}\left(\{t\}\times\Gamma^\varepsilon(t)\right), \end{aligned}$$

and denote by $n^\varepsilon = n^\varepsilon(t,x)$, $t \in S$, $x \in \Gamma^\varepsilon(t)$, the unit normal vector pointing outwards $\Omega_B^\varepsilon(t)$ into $\Omega_A^\varepsilon(t)$. The time-dependent domains $\Omega_i^\varepsilon(t)$ host the phases at time $t \in \overline{S}$ and model the movement of the interface Γ^ε. We emphasize that, for any $t > 0$, the sets $\Omega_A^\varepsilon(t)$, $\Omega_B^\varepsilon(t)$, and $\Gamma^\varepsilon(t)$ do not need to be periodic.

For all $(t,x) \in \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega}$, we introduce the functions

$$F^\varepsilon\colon \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}, \qquad F^\varepsilon(t,x) := \nabla s^\varepsilon(t,x), \tag{1a}$$

$$J^\varepsilon\colon \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad J^\varepsilon(t,x) := \det\left(\nabla s^\varepsilon(t,x)\right), \tag{1b}$$

$$v^\varepsilon\colon \overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^3, \qquad v^\varepsilon(t,x) := \partial_t s^\varepsilon(t,x), \tag{1c}$$

and see that[4]

$$n^\varepsilon(t, s^\varepsilon(t,x)) = \frac{(F^\varepsilon)^{-T}(t,x)n_0^\varepsilon(x)}{|(F^\varepsilon)^{-T}(t,x)n_0^\varepsilon(x)|}. \tag{1d}$$

[3]This is the typical notation in the context of homogenization via the *periodic unfolding method*, see, e.g., [9, 11].

[4]Here, $(F^\varepsilon)^{-T} = \left((F^\varepsilon)^{-1}\right)^T$.



FIGURE 1. Reference geometry and the resulting ε-periodic initial configuration. Note that for $t \neq 0$, these domains typically loose their periodicity.

In addition, we need the *mean curvature* H_Γ^ε and *the normal velocity* (inwards $\Omega_A(t)$) W_Γ^ε of the interface $\Gamma^\varepsilon(t)$ (w.r.t. to the coordinates of the initial configuration!):

$$W_\Gamma^\varepsilon \colon \overline{S} \times \Gamma^\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R}, \quad W_\Gamma^\varepsilon(t,x) := v^\varepsilon(t,x) \cdot n^\varepsilon(t, s^\varepsilon(t,x)), \tag{1e}$$

$$H_\Gamma^\varepsilon \colon \overline{S} \times \Gamma^\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R}, \quad H_\Gamma^\varepsilon(t,x) := -\operatorname{div}\left((F^\varepsilon)^{-1}(t,x) n^\varepsilon(t, s^\varepsilon(t,x))\right). \tag{1f}$$

We note that, via this definition, H_Γ^ε is non positive at points $x \in \Gamma^\varepsilon$, where the intersection of Ω_B^ε and a sufficiently small ball with center x is a convex set, and non negative when this holds true for Ω_A^ε.

Under this given transformation describing the phase transformation, i.e., the function s^ε and the resulting time dependent domains Ω_i^ε, we consider a fully coupled thermoelasticity problem where we assume the mechanical response to be quasi-stationary and the constitutive laws to be linear.

For $i \in \{A, B\}$, $t \in S$, and $x \in \Omega_i^\varepsilon(t)$, let $u_i = u_i(t,x)$ denote the deformation and $\theta_i = \theta_i(t,x)$ the temperature in the respective phase.

The bulk equations are given as (for more details regarding the modeling, we refer to [7, 22])

$$-\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{C}_A^\varepsilon e(u_A^\varepsilon) - \alpha_A^\varepsilon \theta_A \mathbb{I}_3) = f_{u_A}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } Q_A^\varepsilon, \tag{2a}$$

$$-\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{C}_B^\varepsilon e(u_B^\varepsilon) - \alpha_B^\varepsilon \theta_B \mathbb{I}_3) = f_{u_B}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } Q_B^\varepsilon, \tag{2b}$$

$$\partial_t\left(\rho_A c_{dA} \theta_A^\varepsilon + \gamma_A^\varepsilon \operatorname{div} u_A^\varepsilon\right) - \operatorname{div}(K_A^\varepsilon \nabla \theta_A^\varepsilon) = f_{\theta_A}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } Q_A^\varepsilon, \tag{2c}$$

$$\partial_t\left(\rho_B c_{dB} \theta_B^\varepsilon + \gamma_B^\varepsilon \operatorname{div} u_B^\varepsilon\right) - \operatorname{div}(K_B^\varepsilon \nabla \theta_B^\varepsilon) = f_{\theta_B}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } Q_B^\varepsilon. \tag{2d}$$

Here, $\mathcal{C}_i^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3\times3}$ are the *stiffness* tensors, $\alpha_i^\varepsilon > 0$ the *thermal expansion* coefficients, $\rho_i > 0$ the *mass densities*, $c_{di} > 0$ the *heat capacities*, $\gamma_i^\varepsilon > 0$ are the *dissipation coefficients*, $K_i^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$ the *thermal conductivities*, and $f_{u_i}^\varepsilon$, $f_{\theta_i}^\varepsilon$ are volume densities. In addition, $e(v) = 1/2(\nabla v + \nabla v^T)$ denotes the linearized strain tensor and $\mathbb{I}_3$ the identity matrix.

At the interface between the phases, the transmission of both the temperature and deformation is assumed to be continuous,[5] i.e.,

$$[\![u^\varepsilon]\!] = 0, \quad [\![\theta^\varepsilon]\!] = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma^\varepsilon, \tag{2e}$$

[5]These conditions are sometimes called *coherent* and *homothermal*, see [5].

where $[\![v]\!] := v_A - v_B$ denotes the jump across the boundary separating phase A from phase B.

The jump in the flux of force densities across the interface is assumed to be proportional to the mean curvature of the interface leading to

$$[\![\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon \varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) - \alpha^\varepsilon \theta^\varepsilon \mathbb{I}_3]\!] n^\varepsilon = -\varepsilon^2 \widetilde{H_\Gamma^\varepsilon} \sigma_0 n^\varepsilon \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma^\varepsilon, \tag{2f}$$

where $\sigma_0 > 0$ is the coefficient of surface tension and where $\widetilde{H_\Gamma^\varepsilon}$ is the mean curvature of the interface w.r.t. moving coordinates.[6] Here, the scaling via ε^2 counters the effects of both the interface surface area, note that $\varepsilon|\Gamma^\varepsilon| \in \mathcal{O}(1)$, and the curvature itself, note that $\varepsilon|\widetilde{H_\Gamma^\varepsilon}| \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.

In a similar way, the jump of the heat across the interface is assumed to be given via the *latent heat* $L_{AB} \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$[\![\rho c_d]\!] \theta^\varepsilon \widetilde{W_\Gamma^\varepsilon} + [\![\gamma^\varepsilon \operatorname{div} u^\varepsilon]\!] \widetilde{W_\Gamma^\varepsilon} - [\![K^\varepsilon \nabla \theta^\varepsilon]\!] \cdot n^\varepsilon = L_{AB} \widetilde{W_\Gamma^\varepsilon} \quad \text{in} \quad \Sigma^\varepsilon, \tag{2g}$$

where $\widetilde{W_\Gamma^\varepsilon}$ denotes the normal velocity of the interface w.r.t. moving coordinates. Note that, if we neglect the dissipation and if we have equal densities and heat capacities in both phases (or, a bit more general, $[\![\rho c_d]\!] = 0$), equation (2g) reduces to the usual *Stefan condition*. More complex interface conditions then equations (2f), (2f) would arise, if the interface were allowed to be thermodynamically active thereby requiring us to formulate seperate balance equations for surface stress and surface heat, we refer to [43].

Finally, we pose homogeneous *Dirichlet conditions* for the momentum equation and homogeneous *Neumann conditions* for the heat equation as well as initial conditions for the temperature:

$$u_A^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S \times \partial\Omega_A^\varepsilon, \tag{2h}$$

$$-K_A^\varepsilon \nabla \theta_A^\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S \times \partial\Omega_A^\varepsilon, \tag{2i}$$

$$\theta^\varepsilon(0) = \theta_0^\varepsilon \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega, \tag{2j}$$

where θ_0^ε is some (possibly highly heterogeneous) initial temperature distribution.

To summarize, we are considering a highly heterogeneous medium that is composed of two different phases/microstructures where one phase is a connected matrix in which small inclusions of the other phase are (in the beginning, periodically) embedded (see Figure 1), e.g., *bainitic* inclusions in *austenite* steel. Due to phase transformations (in our example, the bainitic inclusions might grow at the cost of the austenite phase) which are assumed to be completely known *a priori*, the phase domains change with time. In this geometrical setting, we then investigate the thermomechanical response of the two-phase medium to the surface stresses exerted by the phase interface due to its curvature (equation (2f)) and the latent heat released via the phase transformation (equation (2g)). We note that this situation has (in spirit) some similarity with the one considered in [14].

Now, we choose a particular scaling (of some coefficients) with respect to the ε-parameter that leads to a distributed microstructure model in the homogenization limit: For $i \in \{A; B\}$, we assume that there are constants $\mathcal{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3\times3}$, $K_i \in$

[6] I.e., $\widetilde{H_\Gamma^\varepsilon}(t, s^\varepsilon(t,x)) = H_\Gamma^\varepsilon(t,x)$.

$\mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$, $\alpha_i, \gamma_i > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_A^\varepsilon &= \mathcal{C}_A, \qquad K_A^\varepsilon = K_A, \qquad \alpha_A^\varepsilon = \alpha_A, \quad \gamma_A^\varepsilon = \gamma_A, \\ \mathcal{C}_B^\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^2 \mathcal{C}_B, \quad K_B^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^2 K_B, \quad \alpha_B^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \alpha_B, \quad \gamma_B^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \gamma_B. \end{aligned}$$

These specific ε-scalings are quite common in the modeling of two-phase media, see, e.g., [2, 10, 15, 17, 44], and are usually justified (albeit only heuristically) by assuming different orders of magnitude of the characteristic time scales of the involved physical processes in the respective domains. In our case, this means that the effect of heat conduction, the dissipation, the stresses, and the thermal expansion are assumed to be smaller/slower in the inclusions when compared to what happens in the matrix. By two-scale convergence results, this scaling leads to a distributed microstructure model, cf. [3, Proposition 1.14. (ii)]. Some other ε-scalings are, of course, possible and, depending on the underlying assumptions regarding the orders of magnitude of the involved processes, might be sensible. Without the scalings in the bulk equations (i.e., for $\mathcal{C}_B^\varepsilon$, K_B^ε, α_B^ε, and γ_B^ε)), e.g., we would expect to get a purely macroscopical limit problem, where only some of the information of the microstructure (and their changes) are coded into the averaged coefficients, similar to the results in [1]. Related problems withno scaling of $\mathcal{C}_B^\varepsilon$ but otherwise the same scaling for similar scenarios (in the context of double poroelasticity) were investigated in [2, 15]. For a more holistic approach to different sets of scalings and their effect on the homogenization procedure, we refer to [32].

We assume that the tensors $\mathcal{C}_i$ and matrices K_i are symmetric and have constant entries and also that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathcal{C}_i M : M \geq c\,|M|^2$ for all symmetric matrices $M \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ and such that $K_i v \cdot v \geq c\,|v|^2$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Note that it would also be possible to treat non-constant coefficients as long as estimates (5a)-(5e) hold uniformly in time and space and as long as the functions are sufficiently regular for the analysis part to hold.[7]

Now, from the construction and the regularity of s, we have the following estimates at hand for the transformation-related quantities defined via equations (1a)-(1f):

$$\begin{aligned} &\|F^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S\times\Omega)^{3\times 3}} + \left\|(F^\varepsilon)^{-1}\right\|_{L^\infty(S\times\Omega)^{3\times 3}} + \|J^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S\times\Omega)} \\ &\qquad + \varepsilon^{-1}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S\times\Omega)^3} + \varepsilon^{-1}\|W_\Gamma^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S\times\Gamma^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon\|H_\Gamma^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S\times\Gamma^\varepsilon)} \leq C, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where C is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. Furthermore, we also see that there is an ε-independent $c > 0$ such that $J^\varepsilon(t,x) \geq c$ for all $(t,x) \in \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega}$.

We introduce the transformed coefficient functions needed to transform equations (2a)-(2j) in a fixed domain, i.e., without movement of the phase interface:

[7] E.g., we would need $\rho_i c_{d_i}$, $\mathcal{C}_i$, and α_i to be differentiable w.r.t. time in order for Lemma 3.5 to hold.

$$\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3\times3}, \qquad \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon B=\frac{1}{2}\left((F^\varepsilon)^{-T}B+\left((F^\varepsilon)^{-T}B\right)^T\right), \tag{4a}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3\times3}, \quad \mathcal{C}_i^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon(\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon)^T\mathcal{C}_i\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon, \tag{4b}$$

$$\alpha_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3}, \qquad \alpha_i^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon\alpha_i(F^\varepsilon)^{-T}, \tag{4c}$$

$$H_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Gamma^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3}, \qquad H_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon\sigma_0H_\Gamma^\varepsilon(F^\varepsilon)^{-1}, \tag{4d}$$

$$c_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}, \qquad c_{di}^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon\rho_ic_{di}, \tag{4e}$$

$$\gamma_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}, \qquad \gamma_i^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon\gamma_i(F^\varepsilon)^{-T}, \tag{4f}$$

$$v^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^3, \qquad v^{ref,\varepsilon}=(F^\varepsilon)^{-1}v^\varepsilon, \tag{4g}$$

$$K_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3}, \qquad K_i^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon(F^\varepsilon)^{-1}K_i(F^\varepsilon)^{-T}, \tag{4h}$$

$$W_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Gamma^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}, \qquad W_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon W_\Gamma^\varepsilon, \tag{4i}$$

$$f_{u_i}^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^3, \qquad f_{u_i}^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon\widehat{f_{u_i}}^\varepsilon, \tag{4j}$$

$$f_{\theta_i}^{ref,\varepsilon}\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}, \qquad f_{\theta_i}^{ref,\varepsilon}=J^\varepsilon\widehat{f_{\theta_i}}^\varepsilon. \tag{4k}$$

For a given function $v=v(t,x)$, we denote the corresponding transformed function by $\widehat{v}^\varepsilon(t,x)=v(t,s^\varepsilon(t,x))$. Then, as a consequence of the estimate (3), there is a $C>0$ independent of $t\in S$, $x\in\Omega$, and $\varepsilon>0$ such that

$$\left|\mathcal{C}_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\right|+\left|\alpha_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\right|+\varepsilon\left|H_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}\right|+\left|c_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\right| \\ +\varepsilon^{-1}\left|v^{ref,\varepsilon}\right|+\left|K_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\right|+\varepsilon^{-1}\left|W_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}\right|\le C. \tag{5a}$$

Furthermore, using the uniform positivity of J^ε, we get the following uniform (all independent of $t\in S$, $x\in\Omega$, and $\varepsilon>0$) positivity estimates

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{ref,\varepsilon}M:M\ge c\left|M\right|^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad M\in\mathrm{Sym}(3), \tag{5b}$$

$$\alpha_i^{ref,\varepsilon}v\cdot v\ge c\left|v\right|^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad v\in\mathbb{R}^3, \tag{5c}$$

$$c_i^{ref,\varepsilon}\ge c, \tag{5d}$$

$$K_i^{ref,\varepsilon}v\cdot v\ge c\left|v\right|^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad v\in\mathbb{R}^3. \tag{5e}$$

Taking the back-transformed quantities (defined on the initial periodic domains Ω_i^ε) $U_i^\varepsilon\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^3$ and $\Theta_i^\varepsilon\colon S\times\Omega_i^\varepsilon\to\mathbb{R}^3$ given via $U_i^\varepsilon(t,x)=u_i^\varepsilon(t,s^{-1,\varepsilon}(t,x))$ and $\Theta_i^\varepsilon(t,x)=\theta_i^\varepsilon(t,s^{-1,\varepsilon}(t,x))$,[8] we get the following problem in fixed coordinates (for more details regarding the transformation to a fixed domain, we refer to [11, 26, 34]):

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(\mathcal{C}_A^{ref,\varepsilon}(U_A^\varepsilon)-\Theta_A^\varepsilon\alpha_A^{ref,\varepsilon}\right)=f_{u_A}^{ref,\varepsilon} \quad \text{in} \quad S\times\Omega_A^\varepsilon, \tag{6a}$$

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(\varepsilon^2\mathcal{C}_B^{ref,\varepsilon}e(U_B^\varepsilon)-\varepsilon\Theta_B^\varepsilon\alpha_B^{ref,\varepsilon}\right)=f_{u_B}^{ref,\varepsilon} \quad \text{in} \quad S\times\Omega_B^\varepsilon, \tag{6b}$$

[8] Here, $s^{-1,\varepsilon}\colon\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega}\to\overline{\Omega}$ is the inverse function of s^ε.

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\left(c_A^{ref,\varepsilon}\Theta_A^\varepsilon+\gamma_A^{ref,\varepsilon}:\nabla U_A^\varepsilon\right)-\operatorname{div}\left(K_A^{ref,\varepsilon}\nabla\Theta_A^\varepsilon\right)\\ -\operatorname{div}\left(\left(c_A^{ref,\varepsilon}\Theta_A^\varepsilon+\gamma_A^{ref,\varepsilon}:\nabla U_A^\varepsilon\right)v^{ref,\varepsilon}\right)=f_{\theta_A}^{ref,\varepsilon}\quad\text{in}\quad S\times\Omega_A^\varepsilon,\end{aligned}\tag{6c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\left(c_B^{ref,\varepsilon}\Theta_B^\varepsilon+\varepsilon\gamma_B^{ref,\varepsilon}:\nabla U_B^\varepsilon\right)-\operatorname{div}\left(\varepsilon^2K_B^{ref,\varepsilon}\nabla\Theta_B^\varepsilon\right)\\ -\operatorname{div}\left(\left(c_B^{ref,\varepsilon}\Theta_B^\varepsilon+\varepsilon\gamma_B^{ref,\varepsilon}:\nabla U_B^\varepsilon\right)v^{ref,\varepsilon}\right)=f_{\theta_B}^{ref,\varepsilon}\quad\text{in}\quad S\times\Omega_B^\varepsilon,\end{aligned}\tag{6d}$$

complemented with interface transmission, boundary, and initial conditions.

Note that the structure of this system is similar to the moving interface problem given via equations (2a)-(2j), except for the advection terms, some additional non-isotropic effects, and the time/space dependency of all coefficients.

3. Analysis of the micro problem

We introduce the functional spaces

$$V_u:=W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)^3,\quad V_\theta:=W^{1,2}(\Omega),\quad H:=L^2(\Omega)$$

and get, after identifying H with their dual via *Riesz's representation map*, the *Gelfand triple*, $V_\theta\hookrightarrow H\hookrightarrow V_\theta{}'$. With $(,)_H$ and $\langle,\rangle_{V'V}$, we denote the inner product of a Hilbert space H and the dual product of a Banach space V, respectively.

Using the well-known *Korn inequality* (see, e.g., [13]), we see that we can use

$$\|u\|_{V_u}:=\|e(v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}+\varepsilon\|e(v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}},$$

where $e(u)=1/2(\nabla u+\nabla u^T)$, instead of the standard Sobolev norm for V_u. In the following Lemma, we establish some control on the parameter ε

Lemma 3.1. *There is a $C>0$ independent of $\varepsilon>0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^3}+\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)^3}+\varepsilon\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}\\ \le C\left(\|e(v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}+\varepsilon\|e(v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}\right),\quad v\in V_u.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Proof. Let $v\in V_u$ and set $v_i^\varepsilon:=v_{|\Omega_i^\varepsilon}$, $i\in\{A,B\}$. Then, via extending v_A^ε appropriately to the whole of Ω (we refer to, e.g., [30, Chapter 1.4]), we call that respective extension $\widetilde{v_A^\varepsilon}$, and then using Korn's inequality, we get the ε-independent estimate

$$\|\widetilde{v_A^\varepsilon}\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}\le C_A\|e(v_A^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}.$$

Now, since $v\in V_u$, we have $w^\varepsilon:=(v-\widetilde{v_A^\varepsilon})_{|\Omega_B^\varepsilon}\in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)$. Via a scaling argument (and using Korn's inequality for functions in $W_0^{1,2}(Y_B)$), we see that

$$\|w^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^3}+\varepsilon\|\nabla w^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}\le\varepsilon C_B\|e(w^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}},$$

which leads to

$$\|v_B^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^3}+\varepsilon\|\nabla v_B^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}\le(1+C_B)\left(\|\widetilde{v_A^\varepsilon}\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)^3}+\varepsilon C_B\|e(v_B^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times3}}\right).$$

Finally, setting $C=\max\{C_A(2+C_B),C_B\}$, we get the desired estimate. □

Our concept of weak formulation corresponding to the problem in fixed domain, equations (6a)-(6d), is given as: Find $(U^\varepsilon,\Theta^\varepsilon)\in L^2(S;V_u\times V_\theta)$ such that

$\partial_t(U^\varepsilon,\Theta^\varepsilon)\in L^2(S;V_u'\times V_\theta')$ and $\Theta^\varepsilon(0)=\theta^\varepsilon_{ext}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}\mathcal{C}^{ref,\varepsilon}_A e(U^\varepsilon_A):e(v)\,\mathrm{d}x+\varepsilon^2\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}\mathcal{C}^{ref,\varepsilon}_B e(U^\varepsilon_B):e(v)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ -\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}\Theta^\varepsilon_A\alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_A:\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x-\varepsilon\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}\Theta^\varepsilon_B\alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_B:\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x\\ =\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}f^{ref,\varepsilon}_{u_A}\cdot v\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}f^{ref,\varepsilon}_{u_B}\cdot v\,\mathrm{d}x+\varepsilon^2\int_{\Gamma^\varepsilon}H^{ref,\varepsilon}_\Gamma n^\varepsilon_0\cdot v\,\mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned}\tag{8a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}\partial_t\left(c^{ref,\varepsilon}_A\Theta^\varepsilon_A\right)v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}v^{ref,\varepsilon}\Theta^\varepsilon_A\cdot\nabla v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &\qquad+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}\partial_t\left(c^{ref,\varepsilon}_B\Theta^\varepsilon_B\right)v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}v^{ref,\varepsilon}\Theta^\varepsilon_B\cdot\nabla v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}\partial_t\left(\gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}_A:\nabla U^\varepsilon_A\right)v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}v^{ref,\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}_A:\nabla U^\varepsilon_A\right)\cdot\nabla v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &+\varepsilon\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}\partial_t\left(\gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}_B:\nabla U^\varepsilon_B\right)v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\varepsilon\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}v^{ref,\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{ref,\varepsilon}_B:\nabla U^\varepsilon_B\right)\cdot\nabla v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &\qquad+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}K^{ref,\varepsilon}_A\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon_A\cdot\nabla v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\varepsilon^2\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}K^{ref,\varepsilon}_B\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon_B\cdot\nabla v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &\qquad+\int_S\int_{\Gamma^\varepsilon}W^{ref,\varepsilon}_\Gamma v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}t=\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}f^{ref,\varepsilon}_{\theta_A}v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}f^{ref,\varepsilon}_{\theta_B}v_\theta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned}\tag{8b}$$

for all $(v_u,v_\theta)\in L^2(S;V_u\times V_\theta)$.

We start off with the mechanical part, i.e., equation (8a), and define, for $t\in S$, the linear operators

$$\begin{aligned}E^\varepsilon(t)\colon V_u\to {V_u}',\qquad & F^\varepsilon(t)\in L^2(\Omega),\\ e^\varepsilon_{th}(t)\colon H\to {V_u}',\qquad & \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(t)\in {V_u}'\end{aligned}$$

via

$$\begin{aligned}\langle E^\varepsilon(t)u,v\rangle_{{V_u}'V_u}&=\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}\mathcal{C}^{ref,\varepsilon}_A(t)e(u):e(v)\,\mathrm{d}x+\varepsilon^2\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}\mathcal{C}^{ref,\varepsilon}_B(t)e(u):e(v)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\ \langle e^\varepsilon_{th}(t)\varphi,v\rangle_{{V_u}'V_u}&=\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A}\varphi\alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_A(t):\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x+\varepsilon\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B}\varphi\alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_B(t):\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x,\\ F^\varepsilon_u(t)&=\begin{cases}f^{ref,\varepsilon}_{u_A}(t), & x\in\Omega^\varepsilon_A\\ f^{ref,\varepsilon}_{u_B}(t), & x\in\Omega^\varepsilon_B\end{cases},\\ \langle\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(t),v\rangle_{{V_u}'V_u}&=\varepsilon^2\int_{\Gamma^\varepsilon}H^{ref,\varepsilon}_\Gamma(t)n^\varepsilon_0\cdot v\,\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

The weak form (8a) is then equivalent to the operator equation

$$E^\varepsilon(t)U^\varepsilon-e^\varepsilon_{th}(t)\Theta^\varepsilon=F^\varepsilon_u(t)+\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(t)\quad\text{in }\ V_u'.\tag{9}$$

Lemma 3.2. *The operator $E^\varepsilon(t)$, $t\in\overline{S}$, is coercive, continuous (both uniformly in time and in the parameter ε), and symmetric.*

Proof. Let $u, v \in H^1(\Omega)$. Due to the estimates (5b), (5c), we instantly have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E^\varepsilon(t)v, v\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u} &\geq c_{\mathcal{C}} \left\|v\right\|_{V_u}^2, \\ \left| \langle E^\varepsilon(t)u, v\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u} \right| &\leq C_{\mathcal{C}} \left\|u\right\|_{V_u} \left\|v\right\|_{V_u} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in \overline{S}$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$. The symmetry follows, after transforming to moving coordinates, from the symmetry of the $\mathcal{C}_i$. □

Since $E^\varepsilon(t)$ is coercive and continuous, we therefore established, via *Lax-Milgram's Lemma*, that, for all $f_u^{ref,\varepsilon} \in L^2(\Omega)$, $H_\Gamma^{ref,\varepsilon} \in L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)$, $\Theta^\varepsilon \in L^2(\Omega)$, and $t \in \overline{S}$, there is a unique weak solution $U^\varepsilon(t) \in V_u$ to Problem 9. In particular, the inverse operator $E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t)$ is well defined and also linear, bounded, and coercive.

Now, we want to turn our attention to the heat related part of our system, i.e., equation (8b), where we deal with the coupling[9] due to the dissipation term. This is done by combining the structure of the full problem (the *coupling operators* are basically dual to one another) and the just investigated properties of the operators of the mechanical part. Note that the following considerations regarding the *thermal stress operator* e_{th}^ε are (in spirit) quite similar to those presented in [37]. We see that, for $v_\theta \in V_\theta$ and $v_u \in V_u$, we have[10]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u} &= \int_{\Omega_A^\varepsilon} v_\theta \alpha_A^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) : \nabla v_u \,\mathrm{d}x + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega_B^\varepsilon} v_\theta \alpha_B^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) : \nabla v_u \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= -\int_{\Omega_A^\varepsilon} \alpha_A^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) \nabla v_\theta \cdot v_u \,\mathrm{d}x - \varepsilon \int_{\Omega_B^\varepsilon} \alpha_B^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) \nabla v_\theta \cdot v_u \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\qquad + \int_{\Gamma^\varepsilon} [\![\alpha]\!] v_\theta n^\varepsilon(t) \cdot v_u \,\mathrm{d}s, \end{aligned}$$

and, as a result,

$$e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta} \colon V_\theta \to L^2(\Omega)^3 \times L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)^3 \subset V_u{}'.$$

In addition, we take a look at the corresponding dual operator $\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta}\right)' : L^2(\Omega)^3 \times L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)^3 \to V_\theta{}'$ given via

$$\left\langle \left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta}\right)' [f,g], v_\theta \right\rangle_{V_\theta{}'V_\theta} = \left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta} v_\theta, [f,g]\right)_{L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)}.$$

For functions $v_u \in V_u$, we have $v_u = [v_u, v_{u|\Gamma^\varepsilon}] \in L^2(\Omega)^3 \times L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)^3$ and see that

$$\left\langle \left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta}\right)' v_u, v_\theta \right\rangle_{V_\theta{}'V_\theta} = \int_{\Omega_A^\varepsilon} v_\theta \alpha_A^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) : \nabla v_u \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega_B^\varepsilon} v_\theta \alpha_B^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) : \nabla v_u \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

As a consequence, we have $\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta}\right)'_{|V_u} : V_u \to H \subset V_\theta{}'$. For $v_u \in V_u$ and $f \in H$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta}\right)'_{|V_u} v_u, f\right)_H &= \int_{\Omega_A^\varepsilon} f \alpha_A^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) : \nabla v_u \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega_B^\varepsilon} f \alpha_B^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) : \nabla v_u \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \langle e_{th}^\varepsilon(t) f, v_u\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)_{|V_\theta}\right)'_{|V_u} = \left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)\right)'$.

Following from the definition of the operator $e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)$, we immediately have the following uniform estimate:

[9] And therefore the mixed derivative term for the deformations u_i^ε.

[10] Here, we used that $[\![\alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}(t)]\!] = [\![\alpha]\!]$ and $\operatorname{div}(J^\varepsilon F^{\varepsilon})^{-\mathrm{T}} = 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *For $v_u \in V_u$ and $f \in H$, it holds (uniform in $t \in \overline{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$)*

$$\left|\langle e_{th}^{\varepsilon}(t)f, v_u\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u}\right| \leq C\|f\|_H \left(\|\nabla v_u\|_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)^{3\times 3}} + \varepsilon\|\nabla v_u\|_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^{3\times 3}}\right). \tag{10}$$

Now, we go on introducing the following linear, t-parametrized functions[11]

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_1^\varepsilon(t)\colon H \to H, && B_1^\varepsilon(t)f = c^{ref,\varepsilon}(t)f,\\
&B_2^\varepsilon(t)\colon H \to H, && B_2^\varepsilon(t)f = \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)\right)' E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t)e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)f,\\
&A_1^\varepsilon(t)\colon V_\theta \to V_\theta', && \langle A_1^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v_\theta\rangle_{V_\theta{}'V_\theta} = \left(\rho c_d v^{ref,\varepsilon}(t)v_\theta, \nabla v_\theta\right)_H\\
&A_2^\varepsilon(t)\colon V_\theta \to V_\theta', && \langle A_2^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v_\theta\rangle_{V_\theta{}'V_\theta} = \left(K^{ref,\varepsilon}(t)\nabla v_\theta, \nabla v_\theta\right)_H,\\
&A_3^\varepsilon(t)\colon V_\theta \to V_\theta', && \langle A_3^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v_\theta\rangle_{V_\theta{}'V_\theta} = \left(v^{ref,\varepsilon}(t)B_2(t)v_\theta, \nabla v_\theta\right)_H.
\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{F}_u^\varepsilon(t) \in V_\theta{}'$, $F_\theta^\varepsilon(t) \in L^2(S;H)$ via

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{F}_u^\varepsilon(t), v_\theta\rangle_{V_\theta{}'V_\theta} &= \left(\partial_t\left(\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)\right)' E^{-1,\varepsilon}\left(F_u^\varepsilon(t) + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(t)\right)\right), v_\theta\right)_H\\
&\quad + \left(v^{ref,\varepsilon}\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)\right)' E^{-1,\varepsilon}\left(F_u^\varepsilon(t) + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(t)\right), \nabla v_\theta\right)_H,\\
F_\theta^\varepsilon(t) &= \begin{cases} f_{\theta_A}^{ref,\varepsilon}(t), & x \in \Omega_A^\varepsilon\\ f_{\theta_B}^{ref,\varepsilon}(t), & x \in \Omega_B^\varepsilon\end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $\mathcal{F}_u^\varepsilon(t)$ is well defined if, for example, $F_u^\varepsilon \in C^1(S;H)^3$.

The variational formulation (8b) can then be rewritten as: Find $\Theta^\varepsilon \in L^2(S;V_\theta)$ such that $\partial_t\Theta^\varepsilon \in L^2(S;V_\theta{}')$, such that $\Theta^\varepsilon(0) = \theta_0^\varepsilon$, and such that

$$\partial_t\left(\sum_{i=1}^{2} B_i^\varepsilon(t)\Theta^\varepsilon\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} A_i^\varepsilon(t)\Theta^\varepsilon + \mathcal{W}_\Gamma^\varepsilon(t) = F_\theta^\varepsilon(t) - \mathcal{F}_u^\varepsilon(t) \quad \text{in } V_\theta'. \tag{11}$$

Lemma 3.4. *The operator B_2^ε is continuous (uniformly in $t \in \overline{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$), self-adjoint, and strictly monotone. In addition, for every $f, g \in H$, we have $(B_2^\varepsilon(\cdot)f, g)_H \in L^\infty(S)$.*

Proof. We start off with proving the continuity property. Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $u_f^\varepsilon := E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t)e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)f$, i.e., the unique solution of

$$\left\langle E^\varepsilon(t)u_f^\varepsilon, v_u\right\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u} = (e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)f, v_u)_H, \quad v_u \in V_u.$$

Due to the estimates from Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we instantly have $\|u_f^\varepsilon\|_{V_u} \leq C\|f\|_H$, which implies, for all $g \in H$,

$$|(B_2^\varepsilon f, g)_H| \leq \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\|e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)g\|_{V_u{}'}\|u_f^\varepsilon\|_{V_u} \leq C\|g\|_H\|f\|_H,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of both $t \in \overline{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. As an immediate consequence, $(B_2^\varepsilon(\cdot)f, g)_H \in L^\infty(S)$. Furthermore, since

$$(B_2^\varepsilon f, g)_\Omega, = \left\langle e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)g, E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t)e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)f\right\rangle_{V_u{}'V_u}$$

and since $E^{-1,\varepsilon}$ is strictly monotone and symmetric, we also have that B_2^ε is monotone and self-adjoint. □

We establish some further regularity (w.r.t. time) of the following operator:

$$B^\varepsilon(t)\colon L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{via} \quad B^\varepsilon(t) = B_1^\varepsilon(t) + B_2^\varepsilon(t).$$

[11]Note that $\gamma^{ref,\varepsilon} = \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}$.

Lemma 3.5. *There is a $C > 0$ independent of $t \in S$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left(B^\varepsilon(t) f, g \right)_H \right| \leq C \left\| f \right\|_H \left\| g \right\|_H$$

for all $f, g \in H$.

Proof. Let $f, g \in H$ be given. Then,

$$\left| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left(B^\varepsilon(t) f, g \right)_H \right| \leq \left| \partial_t \left(c^{ref,\varepsilon}(t) \right) \right| \left\| f \right\|_H \left\| g \right\|_H + \left| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left((e^\varepsilon_{th}(t))' \, E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t) e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) f, g \right)_H \right|.$$

In addition,

$$\left((e^\varepsilon_{th}(t))' \, E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t) e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) f, g \right)_H = \left\langle e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) g, E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t) e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) f \right\rangle_{{V_u}' V_u},$$

where $u^\varepsilon_f(t) := E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t) e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) f$ admits the ε-uniform bound

$$\| u^\varepsilon_f \|_{V_u} \leq C \| f \|_H.$$

Formally, provided that all derivatives exist, we have

$$\partial_t u^\varepsilon_f(t) = \partial_t E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t) e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) f + E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t) \partial_t e^\varepsilon_{th}(t) f.$$

Introducing the operators $\widetilde{E^\varepsilon}(t) \colon V_u \to {V_u}'$ and $\widetilde{e^\varepsilon_{th}}(t) \colon H \to {V_u}'$ via

$$\left\langle \widetilde{E^\varepsilon}(t) u, v \right\rangle_{{V_u}' V_u} = \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A} \partial_t \mathcal{C}^{ref,\varepsilon}_A(t) e(u) : e(v) \, \mathrm{d}x + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B} \partial_t \mathcal{C}^{ref,\varepsilon}_B(t) e(u) : e(v) \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$\left\langle \widetilde{e^\varepsilon_{th}}(t) f, v \right\rangle_{{V_u}' V_u} = \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A} f \partial_t \alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_A(t) : \nabla v \, \mathrm{d}x + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B} f \partial_t \alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_B(t) : \nabla v \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

and $\widetilde{u^\varepsilon_f} \in V_u$ as the unique solution to

$$\left\langle E^\varepsilon(t) \widetilde{u^\varepsilon_f}, v_u \right\rangle_{{V_u}' V_u} = \left\langle \widetilde{e^\varepsilon_{th}} f, v_u \right\rangle_{{V_u}' V_u} - \left\langle \widetilde{E^\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon_f, v_u \right\rangle_{{V_u}' V_u}, \quad v_u \in V_u, \tag{12}$$

we see that this is justified and $\partial_t u^\varepsilon_f = \widetilde{u^\varepsilon_f}$. Furthermore, via testing equation (12) with $\partial_t u^\varepsilon_f$ and using both the uniform bounds on the coefficients and the estimate on u^ε_f, inequality (5a), we see that

$$\left\| \partial_t u^\varepsilon_f(t) \right\|_{V_u} \leq C \left\| f \right\|_H,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $t \in \overline{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, and, due to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left(B^\varepsilon_2(t) f, g \right)_H = &\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A} g \partial_t \alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_A(t) : \nabla u^\varepsilon_f(t) \, \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_A} g \alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_A(t) : \nabla \partial_t u^\varepsilon_f(t) \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \varepsilon \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B} g \partial_t \alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_B(t) : \nabla u^\varepsilon_f(t) \, \mathrm{d}x + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_B} g \alpha^{ref,\varepsilon}_B(t) : \nabla \partial_t u^\varepsilon_f(t) \, \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

we then get the proposed estimate. □

We introduce the operator $A^\varepsilon(t) \colon V_\theta \to {V_\theta}'$ via $A^\varepsilon(t) = \sum_{i=1}^3 A^\varepsilon_i(t)$.

Lemma 3.6. *There are $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ (independent of $t \in \overline{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$) such that*

$$\langle A^\varepsilon(t) v_\theta, v_\theta \rangle_{{V_\theta}' V_\theta} + \lambda_1 \left(B^\varepsilon(t) v_\theta, v_\theta \right)_H \geq \lambda_2 \left\| v_\theta \right\|_{V_\theta}, \quad v_\theta \in V_\theta.$$

Proof. Let $v_\theta \in V_\theta$. Due to the positivity of $c^{ref,\varepsilon}$, equation (5d), and the strict monotonicity of $B_2(t)$, cf. Lemma 3.4, we have

$$(B^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v_\theta)_H \geq c \left\|v_\theta\right\|_H^2, \quad v_\theta \in V_\theta.$$

Using the positivity of K_i (5e), the boundedness of $\varepsilon^{-1}|v^{ref}|$ (4), and the continuity estimate for B_2^ε established in Lemma 3.4, we get

$$\langle A^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v_\theta\rangle_{V_\theta' V_\theta} \geq C_1 \left(\left\|\nabla v_\theta\right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^2 \left\|\nabla v_\theta\right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)}\right) - C_2 \left\|v_\theta\right\|_H^2$$

From those estimates, we see that the statement holds. □

Having now these results available, we are finally able to prove the main existence theorem for the coupled thermoelasticity problem formulated in fixed coordinates.

Theorem 3.7 (Existence Theorem)**.** *Let $F_u^\varepsilon \in C^1(S;H)^3$, $F_\theta^\varepsilon \in L^2(S\times\Omega)$, and $\theta_0^\varepsilon \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then, there exists a unique $(U^\varepsilon, \Theta^\varepsilon) \in L^2(S; V_u \times V_\theta)$ such that $\partial_t(U^\varepsilon, \Theta^\varepsilon) \in L^2(S; {V_u}' \times {V_\theta}')$, such that $\Theta^\varepsilon(0) = \theta_0^\varepsilon$ solving the variational system* (8) *for fixed coordinates.*

Proof. In light of the coercivity-type estimate established in Lemma 3.6 and the continuity estimate for $B_2'(t)$ from Lemma 3.5, we see ([36, Chapter III, Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3]) that there is a unique $\Theta^\varepsilon \in L^2(S; V_\theta)$ such that $\partial_t\Theta^\varepsilon \in L^2(S; {V_\theta}')$, $\Theta^\varepsilon(0) = \theta_0^\varepsilon$, and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(B^\varepsilon(t)\Theta^\varepsilon\right) + A^\varepsilon(t)\Theta^\varepsilon + \mathcal{W}_\Gamma^\varepsilon(t) = F_\theta^\varepsilon(t) - \mathcal{F}_u^\varepsilon(t) \qquad \text{in} \quad {V_\theta}'.$$

Defining, for every $t \in \overline{S}$, [12]

$$U^\varepsilon(t) := E^{-1,\varepsilon}(t)\left(e_{th}^\varepsilon(t)\Theta^\varepsilon(t) + F_u^\varepsilon(t) + \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(t)\right) \in V_u,$$

we see that $\partial_t U^\varepsilon \in L^2(S; {V_u}')$ and that $U^\varepsilon(t)$ solves the mechanical part given via the variational equation (9). □

Transforming the solution $(U^\varepsilon, \Theta^\varepsilon)$ back to moving coordinates, i.e., $u^\varepsilon(t,x) = U^\varepsilon(t, s^\varepsilon(t,x))$ and $\theta^\varepsilon(t,x) = \Theta^\varepsilon(t, s^\varepsilon(t,x))$, we then get the solution to the original problem given by equations (2a)-(2j). In the following theorem, we establish the *a priori* estimates needed to justify the homogenization process.

Theorem 3.8 (ε-independent *a priori* estimates)**.** *Assuming that*

$$\|F_u^\varepsilon\|_{C^1(S;L^2(\Omega))^3} + \|F_\theta^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(S\times\Omega)} + \|\theta_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Theta^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S;H)} + \|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(S\times\Omega_A^\varepsilon)^3} + \varepsilon\|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(S\times\Omega_B^\varepsilon)^3}\\ &+ \|U^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S;H)^3} + \|\nabla U^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S;L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon))^{3\times 3}} + \varepsilon\|\nabla U^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(S;L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon))^{3\times 3}} \leq C, \quad (13)\end{aligned}$$

where C is independent of the choice of ε.

Proof. Testing the variational equality (11) with Θ^ε, using the identity

$$\left(\partial_t\left(B^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta\right), v_\theta\right)_H = \left(\partial_t\left(B^\varepsilon(t)\right)v_\theta, v_\theta\right)_H + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(B^\varepsilon(t)v_\theta, v_\theta\right)_H,$$

[12] Note that, since $\Theta^\varepsilon \in C(\overline{S}; H)$, this is well-defined.

and the uniform operator estimates established in Lemmas 3.2-3.4 and in Lemma 3.6, we get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(B^\varepsilon(t)\Theta^\varepsilon,\Theta^\varepsilon\right)_H + \|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^2\|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)} \\ \leq C\left(\|\Theta^\varepsilon\|^2_H + \|\mathcal{F}^\varepsilon_\theta(t)\|^2_H + \|\mathcal{F}^\varepsilon_u(t)\|^2_{V_\theta'} + \|\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon_\Gamma(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)}\|\Theta^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)}\right).$$

For the temperature on Γ^ε, we have the following ε-trace estimate, see, e.g., [4],

$$\varepsilon\|\Theta^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)} \leq C\left(\|\Theta^\varepsilon\|^2_H + \varepsilon^2\|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon\|^2_H\right). \tag{14}$$

Integrating over $(0,t)$ and using the positivity of B_1^ε and the monotonicity of B_2^ε, we then get

$$\|\Theta^\varepsilon(t)\|^2_H + \int_0^t \|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon(\tau)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_A^\varepsilon)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau + \varepsilon^2\int_0^t\|\nabla\Theta^\varepsilon(\tau)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_B^\varepsilon)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ \leq C\Bigg(\|\Theta^\varepsilon(0)\|^2_H + \int_0^t\|\Theta^\varepsilon(\tau)\|^2_H\,\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^t\|\mathcal{F}^\varepsilon_\theta(\tau)\|^2_H\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ + \int_0^t\|\mathcal{F}^\varepsilon_u(\tau)\|^2_{V_\theta'}\,\mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^t\|\mathcal{W}^\varepsilon_\Gamma(\tau)\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau\Bigg).$$

A direct application of *Gronwall's inequality* then yields the desired estimates for the temperatures. Testing equation (9) with U^ε and using the trace estimate (14), we get

$$\|U^\varepsilon(t)\|^2_{V_u} \leq C\left(\|\Theta^\varepsilon(t)\|^2_H + \|F^\varepsilon(t)\|^2_H + \varepsilon^2\|H^{ref,\varepsilon}_\Gamma(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)}\right).$$

Via the Korn-type estimate given by Lemma 3.1, we see that the estimates for the deformations are valid. □

4. Homogenization

In the following, we use the notion of two-scale convergence to derive a homogenized model. Our basic references for homogenization, in general, and two-scale convergence, in particular, are [3, 23, 29, 39]. For the convenience of the reader, we recall the definition of two-scale convergence:

Definition 4.1 (Two-scale convergence)**.** A sequence $v^\varepsilon \in L^2(S\times\Omega)$ is said to two scale converge two a limit function $v \in L^2(S\times\Omega\times Y)$ ($v^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} v$) if

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_S\int_\Omega v^\varepsilon(t,x)\varphi\left(x,\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_S\int_\Omega\int_Y v(t,x,y)\varphi(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t$$

for all $\varphi \in L^2(S\times\Omega; C_\#(Y))$.

In addition to the two-scale convergence, we introduce the notion of what is sometimes called *strong two-scale convergence*. This concept is needed to pass to the limit for some products of two-scale convergent sequences.

Definition 4.2 (Strong two-scale convergence)**.** A sequence $v^\varepsilon \in L^2(S\times\Omega)$ is said to strongly two scale converge to a limit function $v \in L^2(S\times\Omega\times Y)$ ($v^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} u$) if both $v^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} v$ and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(S\times\Omega)} = \|v\|_{L^2(S\times\Omega\times Y)}.$$

It can be shown, see, e.g., [23, Theorem 18][13], that if $u^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} u$ and $v^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} v$, we then have

$$\int_S \int_\Omega u^\varepsilon(t,x) v^\varepsilon(t,x) \varphi\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t \to \int_S \int_\Omega \int_Y u(t,x,y) v(t,x,y) \varphi(x,y) \,\mathrm{d}y \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega; C_\#^\infty(Y))$.

In the following, for a function $v^\varepsilon \in \Omega_i^\varepsilon$, $i \in \{A, B\}$, we denote its zero extension to the whole of Ω with $\chi_i^\varepsilon v^\varepsilon$. Furthermore, $W_\#^{1,2}(Y)$ is defined as the closure of $C_\#^1(Y)$ w.r.t. $W^{1,2}$-Norm, and $W_{\#}^{1,2}(Y_A)$ as the subspace of $W_\#^{1,2}(Y)$ with zero average. For functions depending on both $x \in \Omega$ and $y \in Y$, we denote derivatives w.r.t. $y \in Y$ with the subscript Y, i.e., e_Y, ∇_Y, div_Y.

By the ε-independent estimates established in Theorem 3.8, we have the following two-scale limits.

Theorem 4.3 (Two-scale limits)**.** *There are functions*

$$\begin{aligned} &u_A \in L^2(S; V_u), && U_B \in L^2(S \times \Omega; W_\#^{1,2}(Y)^3), \\ &\theta_A \in L^2(S; V_\theta), && \Theta_B \in L^2(S \times \Omega; W_\#^{1,2}(Y)), \\ &\widetilde{U_A} \in L^2(S \times \Omega; W_\#^{1,2}(Y)^3), && \widetilde{\Theta_A} \in L^2(S \times \Omega; W_\#^{1,2}(Y)) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi_A^\varepsilon U_A^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_A u_A, && \chi_A^\varepsilon \nabla U_A^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_A \nabla u_A + \chi_A \nabla_Y \widetilde{U_A}, \\ &\chi_B^\varepsilon U_B^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_B U_B, && \chi_B^\varepsilon \nabla U_B^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_B \nabla_Y U_B, \\ &\chi_A^\varepsilon \Theta_A^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_A \theta_A, && \chi_A^\varepsilon \nabla \Theta_A^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_A \nabla \theta_A + \chi_A \nabla_Y \widetilde{\Theta_A}, \\ &\chi_B^\varepsilon \Theta_B^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_B \Theta_B, && \chi_B^\varepsilon \nabla \Theta_B^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_B \nabla_Y \Theta_B. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. Note that, we distinguish between functions that depend on $y \in Y$ and functions independent of $y \in Y$, by using capitalized letters for the former and lowercase letters for the other.

For a function $u = u(t,x,y)$, we set the corresponding transformed function as $\widehat{u}(t,x,y) = u(t,x,s(t,x,y))$. To keep the notation consistent, we also set $U_B(t,x,y) = u_B(t,x,s(t,x,y))$ and $\Theta_B(t,x,y) = \theta_B(t,x,s(t,x,y))$.

Now, we introduce the homogenized transformation related quantities (all elements of $L^\infty(S \times \Omega \times Y)$)

$$F\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}, \quad F(t,x,y) := \nabla_Y s(t,x,y), \tag{15a}$$

$$J\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{Y} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad J(t,x,y) := \det\left(\nabla_Y s(t,x,y)\right), \tag{15b}$$

$$v\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^3, \qquad v(t,x,y) := \partial_t s(t,x,y), \tag{15c}$$

$$W_\Gamma\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad W_\Gamma(t,x,y) := v(t,x,y) \cdot n(t,s(t,x,y)), \tag{15d}$$

$$H_\Gamma\colon \overline{S} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad H_\Gamma(t,x,y) := -\,\mathrm{div}_Y\left(F^{-1}(t,x,y) n(t,s(t,x,y))\right) \tag{15e}$$

and see that they are strong two-scale limits of their ε-periodic counterpart

$$F^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} F, \quad J^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} J, \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} v^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} v, \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} W_\Gamma^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} W_\Gamma, \quad \varepsilon H_\Gamma^\varepsilon \overset{2-str.}{\longrightarrow} H_\Gamma.$$

[13]Combined with the remark succeeding the proof of Theorem 18.

This can be seen by using the regularity of the function s, the fact that $\varepsilon\left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right] \to x$, and using [3, Lemma 1.3.].[14]. For a similar situation in the case of peridodic unfolding, we refer to [11, Lemma 3.4.6]. As a consequence, we also have strong two-scale convergence for the transformed coefficients, see (4a)-(4i), the limits of whose are labeled via a ref-superscript.

We assume that, for $i \in \{A, B\}$ and almost all $t \in S$, there are functions $f_{u_i}(t)$, $f_{\theta_i}(t)$, and $\theta_{i0} \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$, such that $\widehat{f_{u_i}} \in C^1(S; L^2(\Omega \times Y)^3)$ and $\widehat{f_{u_i}} \in L^2(S \times \Omega \times Y)$, and such that

$$\chi_i^\varepsilon \widehat{f_{u_i}^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_i \widehat{f_{u_i}}, \quad \chi_i^\varepsilon \widehat{f_{\theta_i}}^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_i \widehat{f_{\theta_i}}, \quad \chi_i^\varepsilon \theta_0^\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \chi_i \theta_{i0}.$$

In particular, this implies

$$\chi_i^\varepsilon f_{u_i}^{ref,\varepsilon} \overset{2}{\to} \chi_i J\widehat{f_{u_i}} =: \chi_i f_{u_i}^{ref}, \quad \chi_i^\varepsilon f_{\theta_i}^{ref,\varepsilon} \overset{2}{\to} \chi_i J\widehat{f_{\theta_i}} =: \chi_i f_{\theta_i}^{ref}.$$

4.1. **Homogenization of the mechanical part.** Let $v_A \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^3$ and $v_B \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}; C_\#^\infty(Y))^3$ such that $v_A(x) = v_B(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Gamma$. Furthermore, let $\widetilde{v}_A \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}; C_\#^\infty(Y))^3$. We introduce functions

$$\begin{aligned}
&v_A^\varepsilon \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad v_A^\varepsilon(x) := v_A(x) + \varepsilon \widetilde{v}_A\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right),\\
&v_B^\varepsilon \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad v_B^\varepsilon(x) := v_B\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon \widetilde{v}_A\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right),\\
&v^\varepsilon \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad v^\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} v_A^\varepsilon(x), \ x \in \Omega_A, \\ v_B^\varepsilon(x), \ x \in \Omega_B. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $v^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)^3$. Choosing v^ε as a test function and letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we then get, up to a subsequence, the following limit problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref}\big(e(u_A) + e_Y(\widetilde{U}_A)\big) : \big(e(v_A) + e_Y(\widetilde{v}_A)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\qquad + \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} \mathcal{C}_B^{ref} e_Y(U_B) : e_Y(v_B)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \alpha_A^{ref}\theta_A : \big(\nabla v_A + \nabla_Y \widetilde{v}_A\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} \alpha_B^{ref}\Theta_B : \nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} f_{u_A} \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} f_{u_B} \cdot v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \int_\Gamma H_\Gamma^{ref} n \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}x \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

for all

$$(v_A, \widetilde{v}_A, v_B) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \times C_0^\infty(\Omega; C_\#^\infty(Y)) \times C_0^\infty(\Omega; C_\#^\infty(Y)).$$

such that $v_A(x) = v_B(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Gamma$. By density arguments, equation (16) holds also true for all $(v_A, \widetilde{v}_A, v_B)$, where $v_A \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)^3$ and $\widetilde{v}_A, v_B \in L^2(\Omega; W_\#^{1,2}(Y))^3$ such that $v_A(x) = v_B(x, y)$ for almost all $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Gamma$. As a next step, we are going to decouple the limit problem (16). For this goal, we choose

[14]Note that ignoring the "mismatch" $x - \varepsilon\left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right]$, we basically have $F^\varepsilon(t, x) \approx F\left(t, x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$

$v_A \equiv 0$ and $v_B \equiv 0$. We obtain:

$$\int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref}\big(e(u_A) + e_Y(\widetilde{U}_A)\big) : e_Y(\widetilde{v}_A)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\ - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \alpha_A^{ref}\theta_A : \nabla_Y \widetilde{v}_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \quad (17)$$

for all $\widetilde{v}_A \in L^2(\Omega; W^{1,2}_{\#}(Y))^3$.

Now, letting $v_A \equiv 0$ and forcing $v_B = 0$ a.e. on $\Omega \times \Gamma$, we get

$$\int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} \mathcal{C}_B^{ref} e_Y(U_B) : e_Y(v_B)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} \alpha_B^{ref}\Theta_B : \nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} f_{u_B} \cdot v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \quad (18)$$

for all $v_B \in L^2(\Omega; W^{1,2}_0(Y_B))^3$. Next, while keeping $\widetilde{v}_A \equiv 0$, we choose test functions such that $v_A(x) = v_B(x,y)$ for almost all $(x,y) \in \Omega \times Y_B$ (in particular, we have that v_B is constant in $y \in Y$) and see that

$$\int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref}\big(e(u_A) + e_Y(\widetilde{U}_A)\big) : e(v_A)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \alpha_A^{ref}\theta_A : \nabla v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} f_{u_A} \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} f_{u_B} \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \int_\Gamma H_\Gamma^{ref} n \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}x. \quad (19)$$

Summarizing, we obtain the following decoupled (with respect to the test functions) system of variational equalities:

$$\int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref}\big(e(u_A) + e_Y(\widetilde{U}_A)\big) : e(v_A)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \alpha_A^{ref}\theta_A : \nabla v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} f_{u_A} \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} f_{u_B} \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \int_\Gamma H_\Gamma^{ref} \overline{n} \cdot v_A\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}x, \quad (20a)$$

$$\int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref}\big(e(u_A) + e_Y(\widetilde{U}_A)\big) : e_Y(\widetilde{v}_A)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\ - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_A} \alpha_A^{ref}\theta_A : \nabla_Y \widetilde{v}_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x = 0, \quad (20b)$$

$$\int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} \mathcal{C}_B^{ref} e_Y(U_B) : e_Y(v_B)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} \alpha_B^{ref}\Theta_B : \nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \int_\Omega \int_{Y_B} f_{u_B} \cdot v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x \quad (20c)$$

for all $(v_A, \widetilde{v}_A, v_B) \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)^3 \times L^2(\Omega; W^{1,2}_{\#}(Y))^3 \times L^2(\Omega; W^{1,2}_0(Y_B))^3$. In addition to equations (20a)-(20c), we have the additional constraint $u_A(t,x) = U_B(t,x,y)$ for almost all $(t,x,y) \in S \times \Omega \times \Gamma$.

We go on by introducing cell problems and effective quantities to get a more accessible form of the homogenization limit. For $j,k \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $y \in Y$, set $d_{jk} = (y_j\delta_{1k}, y_j\delta_{2k}, y_j\delta_{3k})^T$. For $t \in S$, $x \in \Omega$, let $\tau^u_{jk}(t,x,\cdot)$, $\tau^u(t,x,\cdot) \in H^1_{\#}(Y_A)^3$

are the solutions to

$$0 = \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref} e_Y(\tau_{jk}^u + d_{jk}) : e_Y(\widetilde{v}_A)\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{21a}$$

$$0 = \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref} e_Y(\tau^u) : e_Y(\widetilde{v}_A)\,\mathrm{d}y - \int_{Y_A} \alpha_A^{ref} : \nabla_Y \widetilde{v}_A\,\mathrm{d}y \tag{21b}$$

for all $\widetilde{v}_A \in H^1_{\#}(Y_A)^3$. In addition, we introduce the effective elasticity tensor $\mathcal{C}_A^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3\times3}$, $\mathcal{C}_A^{eff}(t,x) = \left(\mathcal{C}_A^{eff}(t,x)\right)_{1\le i,j,k,l\le 3}$, via

$$\left(\mathcal{C}_A^{eff}\right)_{j_1j_2j_3j_4} = \int_{Y_A} \mathcal{C}_A^{ref} e_Y\left(\tau_{j_1j_2}^u + d_{j_1j_2}\right) : e_Y\left(\tau_{j_3j_4}^u + d_{j_3j_4}\right)\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{21c}$$

Furthermore, we introduce the following effective functions:

$$H_\Gamma^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R},\quad H_\Gamma^{eff}(t,x) = \int_\Gamma H_\Gamma^{ref}(t,x,s)n_0(t,x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{21d}$$

$$f_u^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R},\quad f_u^{eff}(t,x) = \int_{Y_A} f_{u_A}^{ref}(t,x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{Y_B} f_{u_B}^{ref}(t,x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{21e}$$

$$\alpha_A^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times3},\quad \alpha_A^{eff}(t,x) = \int_{Y_A}\left(\alpha_A^{ref} - C_A^{ref} e_Y(\tau^u)\right)\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{21f}$$

We see that, at least up to function independent of $y\in Y$, it holds

$$\widetilde{U_A}(t,x,y) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{3} \tau_{jk}^u(t,x,y)(e(u_A)(t,x))_{jk} + \tau^u(t,x,y)\theta_A(t,x).$$

After transforming the microscopic mechanical part to moving coordinates, we are led to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega C_A^{eff} e(u_A) : e(v_A)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \alpha_A^{eff}\theta_A : \nabla v_A\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \int_\Omega f_u^{eff}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega H_\Gamma^{eff}\,\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned} \tag{22a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{Y_B(t,x)} \mathcal{C}_B e_Y(u_B) : e_Y(v_B)\,\mathrm{d}y - \int_{Y_B(t,x)} \alpha_B\theta_B\,\mathrm{div}_Y\, v_B\,\mathrm{d}y \\ = \int_{Y_B(t,x)} f_{u_B}\cdot v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\end{aligned} \tag{22b}$$

for all $v_A\in H_0^1(\Omega)^3$, $v_B\in H_0^1(Y_B(t,x))^3$ and almost all $t\in S$.

4.2. **Homogenization of the heat part.** Let $(v_A,\widetilde{v}_A)\in C^\infty(\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega})\times C^\infty(\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega};C^\infty_{\#}(Y))$ and $v_B\in C^\infty(\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega};C^\infty_{\#}(Y))$ such that $v_A(T)=\widetilde{v}_A(T)=v_B(T)=0$ and such that $v_A(t,x)=v_B(t,x,y)$ for all $(t,x,y)\in S\times\Omega\times\Gamma$. We introduce the functions

$$\begin{aligned} v_A^\varepsilon\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^3,&\quad v_A^\varepsilon(t,x) = v_A(t,x) + \varepsilon\widetilde{v}_A\left(t,x,\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right),\\ v_B^\varepsilon\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^3,&\quad v_B^\varepsilon(t,x) = v_B\left(t,x,\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon\widetilde{v}_A\left(t,x,\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right),\\ v^\varepsilon\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^3,&\quad v^\varepsilon(t,x) = \begin{cases} v_A^\varepsilon(t,x),\ x\in\Omega_A,\\ v_B^\varepsilon(t,x),\ x\in\Omega_B.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Then, $v^\varepsilon \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Choosing v^ε as a test function and letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we get, up to a subsequence, the following limit problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_S\int_\Omega c_{dA}\,|Y_A|\,\theta_A\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega c_{dA}\,|Y_A|\,\theta_{A0}\partial_t v_A(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad-\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} c_B^{ref}\Theta_B\partial_t v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} c_{dB}\theta_{B0}v_B(0)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} c_B^{ref}v^{ref}\Theta_B\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&-\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_A}\gamma_A^{ref}:\left(\nabla u_A+\nabla_Y\widetilde{U}_A\right)\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B}\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B\partial_t v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} v^{ref}\left(\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B^\varepsilon\right)\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_A} K_A^{ref}\left(\nabla\theta_A+\nabla_Y\widetilde{\Theta}_A\right)\cdot\left(\nabla v_A+\nabla_Y\widetilde{v}_A\right)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} K_B^{ref}\nabla_Y\Theta_B\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_\Gamma W_\Gamma^{ref}v_A\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad=\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_A} f_{\theta_A}^{ref}v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} f_{\theta_B}^{ref}v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $(v_A,\widetilde{v}_A)\in C^\infty(\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega})\times C^\infty(\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega};C^\infty_\#(Y))$ and $v_B\in C^\infty(\overline{S}\times\overline{\Omega};C^\infty_\#(Y))$ such that $v_A(T)=\widetilde{v}_A(T)=v_B(T)=0$ and such that $v_A(t,x)=v_B(t,x,y)$ for all $(t,x,y)\in S\times\Omega\times\Gamma$. Here, $|Y_A|=|Y_A(t,x)|$.

Using the same decoupling strategy as for the mechanical part, we obtain the following system of variational equalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_S\int_\Omega \rho_A c_{dA}\,|Y_A|\,\theta_A\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega \rho_A c_{dA}\,|Y_A|\,\theta_{A0}\partial_t v_A(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad-\int_S\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_B} c_B^{ref}\Theta_B\,\mathrm{d}y\right)\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_B} c_{dB}\theta_{B0}\,\mathrm{d}y\right)v_A(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad-\int_S\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_A}\gamma_A^{ref}:\left(\nabla u_A+\nabla_Y\widetilde{U}_A\right)\,\mathrm{d}y+\int_{Y_B}\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B\,\mathrm{d}y\right)\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_A} K_A^{ref}\left(\nabla\theta_A+\nabla_Y\widetilde{\Theta}_A\right)\cdot\nabla v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega\left(\int_\Gamma W_\Gamma^{ref}\,\mathrm{d}s\right)v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad=\int_S\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_A} f_{\theta_A}^{ref}\,\mathrm{d}y\right)v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_B} f_{\theta_B}^{ref}\,\mathrm{d}y\right)v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t, \qquad (24a)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_A} K_A^{ref}\left(\nabla\theta_A+\nabla_Y\widetilde{\Theta}\right)\cdot\nabla_Y\widetilde{v}_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t=0, \qquad (24b)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} c_B^{ref}\Theta_B\partial_t v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} c_{dB}\theta_{B0}v_B(0)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B}\rho_B c_{dB}v^{ref}\Theta_B\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&-\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B}\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B\partial_t v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} v^{ref}\left(\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B\right)\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\qquad+\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} K_B^{ref}\nabla_Y\Theta_B\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t=\int_S\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} f_{\theta_B}^{ref}v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \quad (24c)
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $(v_A,\widetilde{v}_A,v_B)\in L^2(S;W^{1,2}(\Omega))\times L^2(S\times\Omega;W^{1,2}_{\#}(Y))\times L^2(S\times\Omega;W_0^{1,2}(Y_B))$ such that $(\partial_t v_A,\partial_t v_B)\in L^2(S;(W^{1,2}(\Omega)'))\times L^2(S\times\Omega;W^{-1,2}(Y_B))$ and such that $v_A(T)=v_B(T)=0$.

Now, we want to find a more accessible description of the homogenized problem given via equations (24a)-(24c). With that in mind, for $j\in\{1,2,3\}$, $t\in S$, $x\in\Omega$, let $\tau_j^\theta(t,x,\cdot)\in H^1_{\#}(Y_A)$ be the solution to

$$
\int_{Y_A} K_A^{ref}\left(\nabla_Y\tau_j^\theta+e_j\right)\cdot\nabla_Y\widetilde{v}_A\,\mathrm{d}y=0,\quad \widetilde{v}_A\in W^{1,2}_{\#}(Y_A). \tag{25}
$$

We introduce the following effective functions

$$
\begin{aligned}
&c^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R},\qquad W_\Gamma^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R},\quad \gamma_A^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times 3},\\
&K_A^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times 3},\qquad f_\theta^{eff}\colon S\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}
\end{aligned}
$$

defined via

$$
c^{eff}(t,x)=\rho_A c_{dA}\left|Y_A(t,x)\right|+\alpha_A\int_{Y_A}\mathrm{div}_Y\left(\tau_1^m\right)(t,x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{26a}
$$

$$
K_A^{eff}(t,x)_{ij}=\int_{Y_A}K_A^{ref}(t,x,y)\left(\nabla_Y\tau_j^\theta(t,x,y)+e_j\right)\cdot\left(\nabla_Y\tau_i^\theta(t,x,y)+e_i\right), \tag{26b}
$$

$$
W_\Gamma^{eff}(t,x)=\int_\Gamma W_\Gamma^{ref}(t,x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{26c}
$$

$$
f_\theta^{eff}(t,x)=\int_{Y_A}f_{\theta_A}^{ref}(t,x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y+\int_{Y_B}f_{\theta_B}^{ref}(t,x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y \tag{26d}
$$

$$
\gamma_A^{eff}(t,x)=\int_Y\left(\gamma_A^{ref}+\gamma_A\nabla_Y\tau_{jk}^m(t,x,y)\right)\,\mathrm{d}y+\gamma_B\left|Y_B(t,x)\right|\mathbb{I}_3. \tag{26e}
$$

The system of variational equalities (24a)-(24c) then reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_S\int_\Omega c^{eff}\theta_A\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega c^{eff}(0)\theta_{A0}\partial_t v_A(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&-\int_S\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_B(t,x)}\rho_B c_{dB}\theta_B\,\mathrm{d}y\right)\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega\left(\int_{Y_B(0)}\rho_B c_{dB}\theta_{B0}\,\mathrm{d}y\right)v_A(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad-\int_S\int_\Omega\gamma_A^{eff}:\nabla u_A\partial_t v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega K_A^{eff}\nabla\theta_A\cdot\nabla v_A\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\qquad\qquad=-\int_S\int_\Omega W_\Gamma^{eff}v_A\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_\Omega f_\theta^{eff}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t, \quad (27a)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$-\int_S\int_{Y_B} c_B^{ref}\Theta_B\partial_t v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_{Y_B}\rho_B c_{dB}v^{ref}\Theta_B\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega\int_{Y_B} c_{dB}\theta_{B0}v_B(0)\,\mathrm{d}y$$
$$-\int_S\int_{Y_B}\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B\partial_t v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_S\int_{Y_B} v^{ref}\left(\gamma_B^{ref}:\nabla_Y U_B^\varepsilon\right)\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$+\int_S\int_{Y_B} K_B^{ref}\nabla_Y\Theta_B\cdot\nabla_Y v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t=\int_S\int_{Y_B} f_{\theta_B}^{ref}v_B\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}t \quad (27b)$$

for all $(v_A,v_B)\in L^2(S;W^{1,2}(\Omega))\times L^2(S\times\Omega;W_0^{1,2}(Y_B))$ such that $(\partial_t v_A,\partial_t v_B)\in L^2(S;(W^{1,2}(\Omega)'))\times L^2(S\times\Omega;W^{-1,2}(Y_B))$ and such that $v_A(T)=v_B(T)=0$.

Finally, we are able to present the complete homogenized problem of the initial highly heterogeneous ε-problem given by equations (2a)-(2j). We transform the variational equations (27b) to the moving domain formulation and combine the homogenized mechanical system (equations (22a), (22b)) and the homogenized thermo system (equations (27a), (27b)). Via localization, this results in the following two-scale system of partial differential equations (complemented by initial conditions and macroscopic boundary conditions)

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(\mathcal{C}_A^{eff}e(u_A)-\alpha_A^{eff}\theta_A\right)=f_u^{eff}+H_\Gamma^{eff}\quad\text{in}\quad S\times\Omega, \quad (28a)$$

$$\partial_t\left(c^{eff}\theta_A+\rho_B c_{dB}\int_{Y_B(t,x)}\theta_B\,\mathrm{d}y+\gamma_A^{eff}:\nabla u_A\right)$$
$$-\operatorname{div}\left(K_A^{eff}\nabla\theta_A\right)=f_\theta^{eff}-W_\Gamma^{eff}\quad\text{in}\quad S\times\Omega, \quad (28b)$$

$$-\operatorname{div}_Y\left(\mathcal{C}_B e_Y(u_B)-\alpha_B\theta_B\mathbb{I}_3\right)=f_{u_B}\quad\text{in}\quad Y_B(t,x), \quad (28c)$$

$$\rho_B c_{dB}\partial_t\theta_B+\gamma_B\partial_t\operatorname{div}_Y u_B-\operatorname{div}_Y\left(K_B\nabla_Y\theta_B\right)=f_{\theta_B}\quad\text{in}\quad Y_B(t,x), \quad (28d)$$

$$u_B=u_A,\quad \theta_B=\theta_A\quad\text{on}\quad\partial Y_B(t,x). \quad (28e)$$

This homogenized model is a typical example of what is usually called a *distributed-microstructure* model [35]. In simple words this means that on the one hand, we have obtained an averaged macroscopic description of the coupled thermoelasticity, that is equations (28a) and (28b), while on the other hand, these averaged equations are, at every point $x\in\Omega$, additionally coupled with an x-parametrized microscopic problem, see equations (28c)-(28e).

The coupling between the two-scales (microscopic and macroscopic), again, is two-fold: a) Via the *Dirichlet*-boundary condition on $\partial Y_B(t,x)$ (equation (28e)), which is a direct consequence of the continuity conditions posed on the phase-interface of the ε-microproblem, the macroscopic quantities determine the boundary values of the microscopic quantities. b) In contrast, in the macroscopic heat equation, we see that the average of the microscopic heat density, i.e.,

$$\rho_B c_{dB}\int_{Y_B(t,x)}\theta_B\,\mathrm{d}y$$

is part of the overall heat density. In the case of $\gamma_i=0$, i.e., when there is no dissipation, the *overall effective heat density* $e^{eff}=e^{eff}(t,x)$ would then be given as

$$e^{eff}=c^{eff}\theta_A+\rho_B c_{dB}\int_{Y_B(t,x)}\theta_B\,\mathrm{d}y$$

This seems to suggest that equation (28b) should, actually, be interpreted as a balance equation for the so-called overall heat density, where part of the balanced

quantity, the microscopic temperature θ_B, is given as a solution to the microscopic heat balance equation.

In the homogenization limit, the phase transformation is a purely microscopic phenomenon, where we have the free boundary $\partial Y_B(t,x)$. However, the transformation does also turn up in the macroscopic part, where it enters via the volume force densities *effective mean curvature* H_Γ^{eff} and the *effective normal velocity* W_Γ^{eff}.

Acknowledgments

The authors are indebted to Michael Böhm (Bremen) for initiating and supporting this research. AM thanks NWO MPE "Theoretical estimates of heat losses in geothermal wells" (grant nr. 657.014.004) for funding.

References

[1] A. Ainouz. Homogenized double porosity models for poro-elastic media with interfacial flow barrier. *Math. Bohem.*, 136(4):357–365, 2011.

[2] A. Ainouz. Homogenization of a double porosity model in deformable media. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 90:1–18, 2013.

[3] G. Allaire. Homogenization and two-scale convergence. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 23(6):1482–1518, November 1992.

[4] G. Allaire, A. Damlamian, and U. Hornung. Two-scale convergence on periodic surfaces and applications. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Mathematical Modelling of Flow through Porous Media*, pages 15–25. World Scintific publication, Singapore, 1995.

[5] A. Berezovski and G. A. Maugin. Stress-induced phase-transition front propagation in thermoelastic solids. *Eur. J. Mech. A Solids*, 24(1):1–21, 2005.

[6] M. A. Biot. General theory of three-dimensional consolidation. *Journal of applied physics*, 12(2):155–164, 1941.

[7] M. A. Biot. Thermoelasticity and irreversible thermodynamics. *J. Appl. Phys.*, 27:240–253, 1956.

[8] C. Bringedal, I. Berre, I. S. Pop, and F. A. Radu. Upscaling of nonisothermal reactive porous media flow under dominant Péclet number: the effect of changing porosity. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 14(1):502–533, 2016.

[9] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, and G. Griso. The periodic unfolding method in homogenization. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 40(4):1585–1620, 2008.

[10] G. W. Clark and R. E. Showalter. Two-scale convergence of a model for flow in a partially fissured medium. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 2, 20 pp. (electronic), 1999.

[11] S. Dobberschütz. *Homogenization techniques for lower dimensional structures*. PhD thesis, University of Bremen, 2012.

[12] S. Dobberschütz. Homogenization of a diffusion-reaction system with surface exchange and evolving hypersurface. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 38(3):559–579, 2015.

[13] G. Duvaut and J.-L. Lions. *Inequalities in mechanics and physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976. Translated from the French by C. W. John, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 219.

[14] C. Eck, P. Knabner, and S. Korotov. A two-scale method for the computation of solid-liquid phase transitions with dendritic microstructure. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 178(1):58–80, 2002.

[15] M. Eden and M. Böhm. Homogenization of a poro-elasticity model coupled with diffusive transport and a first order reaction for concrete. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 9(4):599–615, 2014.

[16] H. I. Ene, C. Timofte, and I. Ţenţea. Homogenization of a thermoelasticity model for a composite with imperfect interface. *Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie (N.S.)*, 58(106)(2):147–160, 2015.

[17] T. Fatima, N. Arab, E. P. Zemskov, and A. Muntean. Homogenization of a reaction-diffusion system modeling sulfate corrosion of concrete in locally periodic perforated domains. *J. Engrg. Math.*, 69(2-3):261–276, 2011.

[18] L. C. D. Fielding. The bainite controversy. *Materials Science and Technology*, 29(4):383–399, apr 2013.

[19] G. A. Francfort. Homogenization and linear thermoelasticity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 14(4):696–708, 1983.
[20] M. Höpker and M. Böhm. A note on the existence of extension operators for Sobolev spaces on periodic domains. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 352(10):807–810, 2014.
[21] K. Kumar, T. L. van Noorden, and I. S. Pop. Upscaling of reactive flows in domains with moving oscillating boundaries. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 7(1):95–111, 2014.
[22] V. D. Kupradze. *Three-Dimensional Problems of the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity and Thermoelasticity (North-Holland Series in Applied Mathematics & Mechanics)*. Elsevier Science Ltd, 3 1979.
[23] D. Lukkassen, G. Nguetseng, and P. Wall. Two-scale convergence. *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 2(1):35–86, 2002.
[24] R. Mahnken, A. Schneidt, T. Antretter, U. Ehlenbrker, and M. Wolff. Multi-scale modeling of bainitic phase transformation in multi-variant polycrystalline low alloy steels. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 54:156 – 171, 2015.
[25] S. A. Meier. A homogenisation-based two-scale model for reactive transport in media with evolving microstructure. *Comptes Rendus Mcanique*, 336(8):623 – 628, 2008.
[26] S. A. Meier. *Two-scale models for reactive transport and evolving microstructures*. PhD thesis, University of Bremen, 2008.
[27] A. Mikelić. Recent developments in multiscale problems coming from fluid mechanics. In *Trends in nonlinear analysis*, pages 225–267. Springer, Berlin, 2003.
[28] N. Moelans, B. Blanpain, and P. Wollants. An introduction to phase-field modeling of microstructure evolution. *Calphad*, 32(2):268 – 294, 2008.
[29] G. Nguetseng. A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 20(3):608–623, May 1989.
[30] O. A. Oleinik, A. S. Shamaev, and G. A. Yosifian. *Mathematical Problems in Elasticity and Homogenization, Volume 26 (Studies in Mathematics and its Applications)*. North Holland, 1 edition, 11 1992.
[31] E. Pereloma and D. V. Edmonds, editors. *Phase Transformations in Steels: Fundamentals and Diffusion-Controlled Transformations (Woodhead Publishing Series in Metals and Surface Engineering)*. Woodhead Publishing, 1 edition, 5 2012.
[32] M. A. Peter and M. Böhm. Different choices of scaling in homogenization of diffusion and interfacial exchange in a porous medium. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 31(11):1257–1282, 2008.
[33] R. Peyroux and C. Licht. Homogenization in thermoelasticity: application to composite materials. *Journal de Physique 4*, 3(7,pt3):1623–1626, 1993.
[34] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, and R. Zacher. Qualitative behavior of solutions for thermodynamically consistent Stefan problems with surface tension. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 207(2):611–667, 2013.
[35] R. E. Showalter. Distributed microstructure models of porous media. In *Flow in porous media*, pages 155–163. Springer, 1993.
[36] R. E. Showalter. *Monotone Operators in Banach Space and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations (Mathematical Surveys and Monographs)*. American Mathematical Society, 12 1996.
[37] R. E. Showalter and B. Momken. Single-phase flow in composite poro-elastic media. Technical report, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, 2002.
[38] M. A. Soliman. *Phase transformations and mechanical properties of new austenite-stabilised bainite steels*. PhD thesis, Clausthal-Zellerfeld, 2008.
[39] L. Tartar. *The General Theory of Homogenization: A Personalized Introduction (Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana)*. Springer, 2010 edition, 12 2009.
[40] İ. Temizer and P. Wriggers. Homogenization in finite thermoelasticity. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 59(2):344–372, 2011.
[41] T. L. van Noorden and A. Muntean. Homogenisation of a locally periodic medium with areas of low and high diffusivity. *European J. Appl. Math.*, 22(5):493–516, 2011.
[42] A. Visintin. *Models of Phase Transitions (Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications)*. Birkhuser, 1996 edition, 12 1996.
[43] M. Wolff and M. Böhm. Continuous bodies with thermodynamically active singular sharp interfaces. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, page 1081286515597056, 2015.
[44] L.-M. Yeh. A priori estimate for non-uniform elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 250(4):1828–1849, 2011.

E-mail address: leachim@math.uni-bremen.de
E-mail address: adrian.muntean@kau.se